

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,806,906 to Soga et al. ("*Soga*") in view of U.S. Reissued Patent No. RE38,079 to Washino et al. ("*Washino*") further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0046725 to Sasagawa ("*Sasagawa*"); and rejected claims 6, 12, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Soga* in view of *Washino*, *Sasagawa*, and U.S. Patent No. 6,188,432 to Ejima ("*Ejima*").

Applicants amend claims 1, 7, and 13, and add new claim 18. No impermissible new matter has been added. Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-18 remain pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). There are significant differences between the cited art, whether taken alone or in combination, and the claimed invention. Accordingly, the cited art cannot render the claims obvious.

For example, independent claim 1 recites a combination of elements including "a generation unit for generating capture assist marks to be synthesized with the video signal output, the capture assist marks including (i) a first capture assist mark, within a displayed capture area, corresponding to the first output format, the first capture assist mark comprising a capture assist mark displayed within an effective capture area of the first output format or, when the displayed capture area is greater than the effective capture area of the first output format, at least one of the effective capture area of the first output format or a safety zone of the first output format and (ii) a second capture

assist mark, within the displayed capture area, corresponding to the second output format, the second capture assist mark comprising a capture assist mark displayed within an effective capture area of the second output format or, when the displayed capture area is greater than the effective capture area of the second output format, at least one of the effective capture area of the second output format or a safety zone of the second output format.” (Emphasis added.) The cited art, even if combined, fails to disclose or suggest at least the claimed generation unit.

The Examiner concedes that *Soga* and *Washino* do not expressly teach the capture assist marks including a first capture assist mark corresponding to the first output format and a second capture assist mark corresponding to the second output format. Office Action at 10. Instead, the Examiner relies upon *Sasagawa*. *Id.*

But, *Sasagawa* does not cure the deficiencies of *Soga* and *Washino*. Rather, *Sasagawa* discloses a system that inserts blank regions created along the edges of a standard or widescreen images to maintain their aspect ratios when they are displayed on a screen having a different aspect ratio. That is, *Sasagawa* also fails to disclose or suggest the aforementioned elements of claim 1, at least because the blank regions of *Sasagawa* do not comprise “a first capture assist mark, within a displayed capture area, corresponding to the first output format, the first capture assist mark comprising a capture assist mark displayed within an effective capture area of the first output format or, when the displayed capture area is greater than the effective capture area of the first output format, at least one of the effective capture area of the first output format or a safety zone of the first output format,” (emphasis added) as recited in independent claim 1.

Ejima also fails to cure the deficiencies of *Soga*, *Washino*, and *Sasagawa*.

Accordingly, there are significant differences between the cited art and the claimed invention. The cited art, therefore, fails to render the claimed invention obvious.

Independent claims 7 and 13, while different in scope, distinguish over the cited art for at least similar reasons. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14-17 depend from one of the independent claims. Accordingly, the rejections should be withdrawn.

New claim 18 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests entry of the proposed amendments and the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 1, 2012

By: 

David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220
(202) 408-4000

Philip J. Hoffmann
Registration No. 46,340